

13th March 1928]

(f) whether the Government propose to undertake and complete all the investigation work that is needed to be done in the river-bed at the dam-site before 31st March 1928 ; and if not, why not ?

A.—The position was explained to the hon. Member in the discussion on Resolution No. 12 on 27th February 1928.

- (a) The Government have no exact information.
- (b) The revised estimates contemplate expenditure of Rs. 15,000 this year.
- (c) The budget allotment is Rs. 15,000, but that may be exceeded if a separate division is formed or has been proposed.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) A trench is being dug along the whole length to lay bare the foundation for the Geologist's next visit: the Government do not know exactly how far it has progressed.
- (f) It is impossible to say how much will be done by 31st March. The Chief Engineer has been given the requisite subordinate staff for the purpose and has been asked to push on with the work.

*Proposed upland drainage scheme for carrying water to Coleroon.*

\* 1688 Q.—MR. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state —

(a) whether there is an upland drainage scheme in contemplation by which rain water is proposed to be carried through Vennar and Cauvery to Coleroon ;

(b) whether the Coleroon embankment is strong enough to stand this additional water ;

(c) whether the water cannot be carried to Coleroon by syphons under the Cauvery and Vennar ;

(d) whether the upland drainage water cannot be carried to the sea by the Vattar ; and

(e) whether the whole or portion of the upland drainage water cannot be utilized for the Valanar project and the Mettur Canal system ?

A.—The Government have referred the question to the Chief Engineer for report.

*The Pandavayar Improvement scheme.*

\* 1689 Q.—MR. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state —

(a) whether the report of the Revenue Board on the Pandavayar Improvement scheme has been revived ; and

(b) whether the scheme has been included in the present year's budget ?

A — (a) & (b) No.

[13th March 1928]

Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member when the report is expected ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Very soon, I hope, Sir."

*Irrigation of lands under the Palla authukalvai of Kanganellore village.*

\* 1690 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANICKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the two channels Mettu authukalvai and Palla authukalvai of Kanganellore village, Gudiyattam taluk, are classed as separate irrigation sources in the resettlement accounts; if so, what is the extent of irrigation under each channel;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Palla authukalvai has been totally neglected without being repaired either by Government or by enforcing kudimaramat labour;

(c) whether it is a fact that the whole extent of the Mettu authukalvai and Palla authukalvai lands are now irrigated by only the Mettu authukalvai water;

(d) why the Government have allowed such a step being adopted when there are laud-marks of a separate neglected channel;

(e) whether the Government are aware that the head sluice built at the head of Palla authukalvai involving an outlay of Rs. 2,500 is left unused;

(f) whether the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam inspected the structure and the channel running in the rear of it and why no steps were taken to restore the channel though frequently requested by ryots;

(g) whether the Government are aware that the real cause of vast shavi in years of ordinary rainfall is due to insufficient flow in the channel and the illegal taking away of Mettu authukalvai water to Palla authukalvai lands;

(h) whether it is a fact that the ryots petitioned to the Collector of North Arcot on 28th April 1926 to restore the channel, and whether the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam to whom it was forwarded has given an endorsement to say " மாற்றல்படி நடந்துக்கொள்ளவும் ";

(i) whether the Government are aware that the Su-Collector, Vellore, old North Arcot district, in his order dated 5th November 1883, ordered the Tahsildar to restore the Palla authukalvai and not to give permission to take Mettu authukalvai water for Palla authukalvai lands and that it was confirmed by the Collector of North Arcot in his Supplemental Appeal Case No. 180 of 1883; and

(j) whether the Government will ask the Collector of North Arcot to allot the necessary funds for restoring the Palla authukalvai and thus open Palla authukalvai for Palla authukalvai lands and totally separate the irrigation by the respective channels?

A.—(a) The two channels have been classified as separate irrigation sources and their registered wet ayacuts are 290.78 acres and 499.93 acres respectively.

(b) to (j) The Government have not the information and have called for a report.